United States District Court District of Massachusetts Boston Division

Prof Ron Veatch, of Law IJD,) Petitioner,)	05-40	145 pm
vs.	Case No.	
United States Defacto Regime;) George W. Bush, et.al.;) and	6 % <i>a</i>	٠ ((٩
David Winn, Warden) FMC Devens & A-Z;) Defendants.)		

Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus
U.S. Constitution Article I §9 Cl.2
For Injunctive Relief from Imposition of
Non-Authorized Custody and Brief

Comes now, Petitioner, Ron Veatch, appearing pro-se and moves the Court to injoin the U.S. Federal Regime via Department of Justice and Defendants herein from imposing Federal Supervised Release upon termination of treasonable Federal Police State Statutes and in support states:

Jurisdiction: U.S. Constitution Article I §9 Cl.2 i.e. the Great Writ of Habeas Corpus. Nothing in 28 U.S.C. §2241 or other statutes have vacated the Writ of Habeas Corpus under Article I §9 Cl.2 thus the Writ is Constitutionally before this Court.

Case in Chief

Ron Veatch was sentenced to 14 years in prison by a vindictive and treasonable Federal Judge in imposing Federal Police State Jurisdiction to railroad Mr. Veatch. However, most Federal Judges do not Support the U.S. Constitution Article VI Cl.3 & Amendment 14, nor does the Executive and Congressional branches of this Regime under Article II §1

C1.8.

The issue today, is not the time that Mr. Veatch had already spent in prison. This Writ deals only with imposing 5 years Supervised Release upon Mr. Veatch. The reason being, is that, the statutory schemes Mr. Veatch was convicted of DO NOT ALLOW and/or GRANT THE FEDERAL COURTS AND THIS DEFACTO REGIME TO IMPOSE SUPERVISED RELEASE. Mr. Veatch was convicted of violating 18 U.S.C. §§§§§ 2;371;1014;1344;1956(a)(1)(A)(i) and 42 U.S.C. §408, in which none of these statutes authorize imposition of Supervised Release, Parole, or Probation. And Mr. Veatch has in FACT refused to allow the defactopRegime to impose custody of any Supervised Release. Thus, Mr. Veatch moves the Court to injoin and restrain the Federal Defacto Regime from arresting and/or imprisoning him further due to the clear statutory language does not grant the Federal Defacto Courts and/or Regime to impose Supervised Release, which is, per-se Parole/Probation. The Statutes that Mr. Veatch was unconstitutionally convicted of allows a term of actual imprisonment, and/or fines, but does not authorize Supervised Release.

The U.S. Sentencing Guidelines cannot and never could alter statutory enforcement and/or additional punishment. In fact, the U.S.S.G. are advisory only and do not have force of law.

CONCLUSION

Wherefore, Ron Veatch, moves the Court to Grant this
Writ of Habeas Corpus and declare that Supervised Release
is unconstitutional as the statutes do not authorize Supervised

Release, thus Defendants are hereby injoined and restrained in imposing Supervised Release upon Mr. Veatch. Mr. Veatch further moves the Court to declare all Supervise Releases i.e. Federal Probation unconstitutional, unless the Statutory language expressly states Supervised Release i.e. Federal Probation is authorized in addition to a term of Federal PRison and/or fines. In 18 U.S.C. §§§§§ 2;371;1014;1344 & 1956 & 42 U.S.C. § 408 it does not authorize Supervised Release after a term of Federal Imprisonment. Thus, further custody upon Mr. Veatch's liberty and freedom may not be imposed and this Writ of Habeas Corpus is and hereby granted.

Respectfully Submitted.

Prof. Ron Veatch of Law IJD Holocaust # 11079-088

P.O.Box 879 Ayer, MA 01432

Certificate of Service

0n <u>8 - 8</u>	_ 2005, a true copy of this Writ
of Habeas Corpus Art. I §9 (Cl.2 was mailed to:
U.S. Attorney (for defendant One Counthouse UN	
Boston, MA 0/270	
	and
Clerk, U.S. District Court Ove Counthouse HAZ Fedomi Blag	-A-WAY
Boston, MA 0/220	- .
	Por Voctob